Application Number: 10/762,388 Docket: 7210.03

Reply to O.A. of August 29, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 27 are presently pending.

Claim 28 was canceled in the response to the Restriction Requirement. The Response to Restriction Requirement was filed June 8, 2005, in which claim 28 was canceled.

Therefore, claims 1 through 27 remain under examination.

Rejection of Claims 1 through 28 under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1 through 28 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,425.

Applicant is hereby enclosing a terminal disclaimer, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1 through 28 under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1 through 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, because the of the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 28 was canceled previously in the response to Restriction Requirement.

Therefore, claims 1 through 27 are pending.

The Office Action states thatthe specification...does not reasonably provide enablement for treating or preventing.... In response to this, only canceled claim 28 referenced treating or preventing. Pending claims 1 through 27 are methods claims directed to methods to inhibit activation of an inflammatory cell... There is no claim of prevention.

It appears that the Office Action makes an oversight in this regard. There is no reference in pending claims 1 through 27 that the method is preventative; the method treats the identified inflammation.

Application Number: 10/762,388 Docket: 7210.03

Reply to O.A. of August 29, 2005

Examples 1 and 2 in the specification provide support to treat inflammation of epithelial cells. Furthermore, the compounds identified throughout the claims are fully supported by the specification. (See Example 3, Synthesis of Lipoxin Analog Compounds.)

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Reply to O.A. of August 29, 2005

CONCLUSION

This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. If a telephonic consultation would help to expedite the processing of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below at the Examiner's convenience.

No fees are considered due at this time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 04-1420.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP **Customer Number 25763**

Date: November 17, 2005

Scott D. Rothenberger, Esq.

Reg. No. 41,277

By:

Intellectual Property Department Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498

(612) 340-8819